UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/583,364	06/19/2006	Joseph Zawierucha	3165-147	8196	
	7590 08/20/201 FIGG, ERNST & MAN	EXAMINER			
1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			SULLIVAN, DANIELLE D		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1617		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/20/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/583,364	ZAWIERUCHA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	DANIELLE SULLIVAN	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>29 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);	
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a company of the present additional claims.</li> </ul>			ie issues ioi
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul><li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li><li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	-
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	kplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Ernst V Arnold/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1616	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: There are no claim amendments to enter or that place the claims in condition for allowance and Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive. Applicant argues that Maclaren et al. fail to suggest the use of carfentrazone for killing pine. The Examiner is not persuaded by this argument because it is the combination of Maclaren et al. in view of Hacker et al. that is relied upon to teach the combination of imazapyr and carfentrazone. Since, Hacker et al. teaches that combining carfentrazone with imazapyr is known to synergistically increase herbicidal effect one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivation to add carfentrazone in a method of controlling wildling pine with imazapyr. Furthermore, Applicant argues that Hacker and Maclaren fail to show experimental data for the use of the combination of imazapyr and carfentrazone. The Examiner is not persuaded by this argument because Hacker suggests that the combination of the herbicides result in synergistically increased effects. The data submited by applicant in the specification Tables 1-3 fail to show control results for carfentrazone used by itself. Hence, it is impossible to know if carfentrazone alone increases herbicidal effect or if it is the combination of imazypyr and carfentrazone that provides a synergistic effect which would be an unexpected result and perhaps unobvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art. Finally, applicants argument that the combination of references is improper is not convincing because Maclaren does not teach applying imazapyr via the hack and squirt method. Claims 1, 4-6, 14-20 and 34-40 are pending with claims 36-38 and 40 being withdrawn and claims 1, 4-6, 14-20, 34, 35 and 39 rejected.